REMARKS

The present Amendment cancels claims 1-10 and adds new claims 11-13. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 11-13.

The Examiner's cooperation is respectfully requested to contact Applicant's Attorney by telephone to discuss the outstanding issues of the present application prior to examination.

Claims 1-8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Takano (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0099685); claims 8 stands rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Simske (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0064447); and claim 9 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Simske in view of Yang (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0163453). As indicated above claims 1-10 were canceled there these rejections are rendered moot. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

The present amendment adds new claims 11-13 which more clearly describe that the present invention is directed to an information searching method not taught or suggested by any of the references of record.

According to the present invention the information searching method includes inputting a search inquiry character train into a first block, forming a summary word list including a plurality of words to be searched based on both the search inquiry character train inputted through the inputting step and data having been stored in advance in a database provided within a second block, further inputting a restricting condition for narrowing down search targets for

the plurality of words to be searched, the restricting condition being selected from a group including an existence of an indispensable word, and an existence of a taboo word, judging whether or not each of the plurality of words satisfies the restricting condition, calculating similarity for each of words of the plurality of words in case that a word of the plurality words satisfies the restricting condition with a document having been stored in the database, while further judging whether or not another words of the plurality of words satisfies the restricting condition in case that a word of the plurality of words breaches the restricting condition, searching the database for the words of the plurality of words satisfying the restricting condition with similarity which has been calculated, and outputting search results of the searching step.

The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record whether taken individually or in combination with each other. Particularly, the above described features of the present invention are not taught or suggested by Takano, Simske or Yang whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner.

It should be noted that Takano is assigned to the same Assignee as that of the present application and as such should the Examiner remove the 35 USC §102(e) rejection and is of the opinion that the claims may be obvious relative to Takano, attention is directed to 35 USC §103(c). This statute essentially states that subject matter developed by another which qualifies as prior art only under 35 USC §102(e) shall not preclude patentability where the subject matter and the claimed invention were at the time the claimed invention was made owned by the same entity. Such would be case

7

regarding the rejection of claims 1-8 and 10 is the 35 USC §102(e) rejection is removed and replaced by a rejection under 35 USC §103(a) based on Takano.

It is submitted that the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Takano. Takano merely discloses that some databases accept all Boolean expressions, whereas other databases accept only a limited number of Boolean expressions such as AND or OR. Takano teaches that to account of such the usage of each search engine is recorded in the Boolean expression confirmation means 6015 of the search server 601 and a search is sent to a search engine using the simplest form of the query expression acceptable by the particular search engine. Attention is directed to paragraph [0115] of Takano.

Takano teaches that after an associative search or/and key word search, the selected topic words are used as keys for a subsequent search. Attention is directed to paragraph [0114] of Fig. 3 of Takano. Takano discloses that the search server merges the search result of the key word search type databases and associative document search byte databases as set forth in paragraph [0109] - [0111] as illustrated, for example, in Fig. 8.

Thus, at no point is there any teaching or suggestion in Takano that allows the forming of a summary word list based on the search inquiry character train and the inputting of a restricting condition for narrowing down search targets such as indispensable word and the existence of an indispensable word and a taboo word as in the present invention. According to the present invention as recited in the claims, searching is conducted in the

8

document database to select documents having similarity with the summary word list and each selected document is examined regarding adaptability so as to determine whether the document satisfies the restricting condition. In the present invention, search results is output identifying documents that satisfy the restricting condition among the documents selected according to the similarity based on the search performed by the search step. These features of the present invention are discussed, for example, on page 47, lines 13-23 of the present application. Such features are clearly not taught or suggested by Takano.

Thus, Takano fails to teach or suggest inputting a search inquiry character train into a first block, forming a summary word list including a plurality of words to be searched based on both the search inquiry character train inputted through the inputting step and data having been stored in advance in a database provided within a second block, and further inputting a restricting condition for narrowing down search targets for the plurality of words to be searched, the restricting condition being selected from a group including an existence of an indispensable word, and an existence of a taboo word as recited in the claims.

Further, Takano fails to teach or suggest judging whether or not each of the plurality of words satisfies the restricting condition, calculating similarity for each of words of the plurality of words in case that a word of the plurality words satisfies the restricting condition with a document having been stored in the database, while further judging whether or not another words of the plurality of words satisfies the restricting condition in case that a word of the plurality of words breaches the restricting condition, searching the database

for the words of the plurality of words satisfying the restricting condition with similarity which has been calculated, and outputting search results of the searching step as recited in the claims.

Therefore, Takano fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims and as such does not does not anticipate nor render obvious the features of the present invention as recited in the claims.

The above described deficiencies of Takano are also evident in Simske and Yang. Therefore, Simske whether taken individually or in combination with Yang in the manner suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action do not teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims.

Simske teaches a system and method for computerized searching for desired information from a corpus of information. As per Simske a query for desired information is received by a synonymic search application and an input tuning is received so that the amount of synonymic broadening to be applied to the received query for constructing a synonymic search query to be utilized for searching for the desired information. Yang merely teaches the narrowing of the search from search results.

However, there is absolutely no teaching or suggestion in Simske or Yang of any of the above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims, said features having been shown above not to be taught or suggested by Takano.

Thus, both Simske and Yang fail to teach or suggest inputting a search inquiry character train into a first block, forming a summary word list including

a plurality of words to be searched based on both the search inquiry character train inputted through the inputting step and data having been stored in advance in a database provided within a second block, and further inputting a restricting condition for narrowing down search targets for the plurality of words to be searched, the restricting condition being selected from a group including an existence of an indispensable word, and an existence of a taboo word as recited in the claims.

Further, both Simske and Yang fail to teach or suggest judging whether or not each of the plurality of words satisfies the restricting condition, calculating similarity for each of words of the plurality of words in case that a word of the plurality words satisfies the restricting condition with a document having been stored in the database, while further judging whether or not another words of the plurality of words satisfies the restricting condition in case that a word of the plurality of words breaches the restricting condition, searching the database for the words of the plurality of words satisfying the restricting condition with similarity which has been calculated, and outputting search results of the searching step as recited in the claims.

Therefore, Simske whether taken individually or in combination with Yang in the manner suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action does not teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims and as such combining these references in the manner suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action does not render obvious the features of the present invention as recited in the claims.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references utilized in the rejection of claims 1-10.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that claims 11-13 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 11-13 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (ASA-1169).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 684-1120

12